

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMME United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/808,965	03/25/2004		Raghunath Vitthal Chaudhari	A36200-PCT-USA-A; 066123.	7075
21003	7590	04/21/2006		EXAMINER	
BAKER & I	BOTTS		OH, TAYLOR V		
30 ROCKEFI	ELLER PL	AZA			0.000.000.000
44TH FLOOI	ζ		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK NY 10112				1625	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/808,965	CHAUDHARI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Taylor Victor Oh	1625		

	Taylor Victor Oh	1625	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 29 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ring replies: (1) an amendment, affice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in a e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply market	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
 a)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	6.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action: or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO v);	TE below);	
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims. 			the issues for
NOTE: see pages 2-5. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41	.33(a)).		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		-	•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	_ will not be entered, or b)	ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidav	rit or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	ice because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	

Art Unit: 1625

It is noted that applicants have filed an Amendment after the Final Rejection on 3/29/06; applicants' attorney has addressed the issues of record. The proposed amendment will not be entered because it raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search; and, it is not in a condition for allowance.

The Status of Claims

Claims 1-8, and 11-23 are pending.

Claims 1-8, and 11-23 have been rejected.

The New Issue

The introduction of the new phrase "a palladium phosphine complex" into claims 1,8, and 13 would require further consideration and/or search since the scope of the claimed invention becomes narrower than before.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The rejection of Claims 1-8, and 11-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cesa et al (EP 0144118) in view of Nicholson et al (US 5,744,650) has been maintained.

Application/Control Number: 10/808,965

Art Unit: 1625

The rejection of Claims 1-8, and 11-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cesa et al (EP 0144118) in view of Nicholson et al (US 5,744,650) has been maintained with the reasons of record on 2/10/05.

Applicants' attorney has addressed the issues of record; however, has not rebutted the claim rejections *1-8*, *and 11-23* under 35 USC 103 (a).

Applicants' Argument

Applicants argue the following issues:

- a. Neither Cesa nor Nicholson disclose the use of a nitrogen or oxygen containing organic compound as a ligand to increase catalytic activity;
- b. Nicholson teaches away from phoshine catalysis in a CO environment.

Applicants' arguments have been noted, but the arguments are not persuasive.

First, regarding the first and second arguments, the Examiner has noted applicant's argument. However, the claims are not directed to the increased catalytic activity of the claimed process using nitrogen or oxygen containing organic compounds, but the claims are more directed to the process for preparing a 2-hydroxy carboxylic acid using a reusable catalyst. Furthermore, Cesa et al expressly teaches that when

Art Unit: 1625

using ^(\$\phi_3^P) 2^{PdCl}² or ^{Pd(P\$\phi_3)} 4 ^{catalyst}, other palladium compounds</sup>, CH₃CN or/ and terahydrofuran can be used together during the reaction process(see col. 4 ,lines 30-37); from this, there is still a teaching for the organic ligand surrounding palladium catalyst. Also, concerning phoshine catalysis in a CO environment, the primary Cesa prior art process does point out that when a metal is complexed with a phospine, the carbonylation and the hydrolysis do take place effectively in the CO environment (see col. 5 ,lines 18-29). Therefore, applicants' arguments are irrelevant to the issue of the invention.

Furthermore, since the newly potentially revised claim claims 1,8, and 13 has a narrower scope of the invention than the previous one, this requires new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. Therefore, the newly amended claims are not going to enter.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taylor Victor Oh whose telephone number is 571-272-0689. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/808,965

Art Unit: 1625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 5

Jay Part. 14 4/19/56